DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 225 PS 019 157

AUTHOR Lombardi, Joan
TITLE Financing Issues in the Preparation and Professional Development of the Early Childhood Workforce.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Preparation and Professional Development Programs for Early Childhood Educators: Emerging Needs for the Next Decade (New York, NY, November 7-8, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Early Childhood Education; Expenditures; Federal Programs; *Financial Support; Government Role; *Professional Development; Program Costs; *Public Policy; *Research Needs; State Programs; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS CDA; Child Development Associate; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

At a time of tremendous expansion of early childhood services, funds to train the needed work force are almost unavailable outside of the Head Start community. This problem is compounded by the limited amount of attention that the topic of early childhood teacher preparation and professional development has received from researchers and policymakers. This paper addresses this situation by making an attempt to define the issues and describe some of what is known about the financing of professional preparation. Three questions are of particular interest: (1) Why is the financing of preparation and professional development so important to this work force? (2) What is known about costs and expenditures for early childhood training? (3) What should a research and policy agenda include in regard to financing issues? The second question is treated extensively. Several federal sources of training funds are identified, and a publication that lists examples of private sector support for training center-based and family day care providers throughout the country is cited. Concluding remarks advance four strategies for moving the policy agenda forward: (1) expand federal legislation; (2) disseminate information regarding legislative models; (3) promote private sector investments; and (4) launch a public awareness campaign on the need for qualified staff. (19 references) (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED325225

FINANCING ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHILDHOOD WORKFORCE

Joan Lombardi
Early Childhood and
Public Policy Specialist

At a time of tremendous expansion of early childhood services, we are faced with almost a complete vacuum of available funds to train the necesary workforce, particularly outside of the Head Start community. Yet, a review of the recent early childhood research and policy literature indicates that the financing of early childhood preparation and professional development has received relatively limited attention. This paper is therefore an initial attempt to begin to define the issues and to capture some of what we do know about the financing of professional preparation. This discussion will focus on three questions:

- Why is the financing of preparation and professional development so important to this particular workforce?
- What do we know about current costs and expenditures for early childhood training?
- What should be included in a research and policy agenda regarding financing issues?

Why is the financing of preparation and professional development so important to this particular workforce?

Following two decades of unprecedented demand for early childhood services, the anticipated passage of landmark child care legislation and sizeable increases in Head Start brings us to the dawn of a second wave of program expansion. At the same time, we have become increasingly aware of the importance of a trained and stable workforce, and yet continue to experience high turnover and severe shortages of well qualified staff. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate resources for professional development affects both the supply and quality of early childhood training as well as the ability of providers and programs to access good training even when it is available.

Furthermore, there are very few other incentives to encourage providers to pursue professional preparation. For example, according to a recent report by The Children's Defense Fund (Adams, 1990), 35 states require no training whatsoever

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan Lombardi
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

for family child care providers and 32 states do not require specific levels of formal training before teachers are hired in child care centers. Without requirments, decisionmakers at both the program and policy level may be less than willing to provide funds for training.

Inadequate salaries and the lack of a career ladder inhibit providers from voluntarily investing in their own professional development. According to the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips, 1989), although teachers with a BA degree did earn approximately one dollar an hour more than teachers with some college ($6.53 per hour compared to $5.56 per hour), this amount would not cover the cost of acquiring that education. The GAO study of high quality programs (1989), reported that wages in NAEYC accredited centers did rise with education and experience. However, each year of education increased wages by only 6 percent.

Similarly, the National CDA Survey conducted by the Council on Early Childood Professional Recognition (1988), indicated that although 52% of the CDA's received a salary increase as a direct result of having earned the credential, these increases were minimal (43% received less than $100 and only 20% received increases over 500 per year). Moreover, although at least eight states have taken steps to improve salaries through budget or legislative action (Whitebook, Pemberton, Lombardi and Galinsky, 1990), relatively few of these efforts have resulted in significant or continued salary improvements and/or have been linked to an established career ladder.

What do we know about costs and expenditures for early childhood training?

There is very little, if any, systematic information on either the current costs or expenditures of early childhood training. Although we have anecdotal information on isolated training costs, to develop a true picture of costs at either the individual program level or in the aggregate, we would need to define what we mean by training costs. For example:

- Which costs are we referring to? The total cost of delivery, tuition assistance only, release time from work, resources to support the training system ?

- Who is to be trained ? Supervisors (directors and education coordinators), teachers/ family day care providers, teaching staff, or all staff ?

- What level of training is to be funded ? Workshops, continuing education, credits/courses towards certification/credentialing, two year degrees, four year degrees, graduate work?

- What quality provisions should be included in the costs of training ?

Despite the lack of such comprehensive data, consideration of the following brief examples of costs can be instructive in beginning to formulate an overall sense of need.

According to Dr. Carol Phillips, the 1988 Survey of Training Provided by Post Secondary Institutions, conducted by the Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition, indicated that the cost of a certificate in early childhood ranged from $800-$1033. The average number of credits in the certificate programs were 30-39, with the median cost per credit at $25.00 and the mean cost at $37.00 per credit. The cost of an Associates degree ranged from $1840-$2827. The average number of credits in the two year degree programs were 60-69, with the median cost per credit at $18.00 and the mean cost at $49.00 per credit. Phillips indicated that the rough estimate for implementing the new Council model for CDA is $1500.00. This is designed to cover the cost of operation plus payment to the seminar instructor, advisor and CDA Representative (Phillips, 1990).

Given that California has had a more extensive system of support for early childhood training than most states, it is also illustrative to consider their costs. The following figures were prepared by Peyton Nattinger (1990), an instructor in the California Community College sytem: (Note: trainee costs are tuition only, does not include books, housing, food, transportation, etc).

State licensing (12 units)	-	Public costs	$1053.00
		Trainee costs	63.00
Certificate (20 units)	-	Public costs	$2281.00
		Trainee costs	105.00
Children's Center Permit (40 units)	-	Public costs	$3840.00
		Trainee costs	200.00
AA Degress (60 units)	-	Public costs	$5731.00
		Trainee costs	200.00

Finally, several early childhood programs (in combination with private sources) have moved to invest training dollars in the trainer, who will then in turn supervise and/or provide

training directly to several teaching staff. This model has been used extensively by The High Scope Educational Research Foundation. According to Dr. Larry Schweinhart, Chairman of the Reasearch Division, the cost of High Scope training of trainers is approximately $6000.00. (Schweinhart, 1990)

Although we could collect several other examples of program costs, the data on training expenditures is less readily available. A cursory review of information regarding expenditures for early childhood training at the federal, state, and program level, as well as by the private sector, revealed the following:

In their publication, Funding for Child Care Training: A Federal Yellow Pages, The Child Welfare League (Durbin, Kopp and Toland, 1990), list some 33 federal sources for child care training. These include programs that focus on job training, nutrition education, literacy, bilingual programs, child abuse prevention and many other topics. However, several sources listed target funds for specific projects such as the Comprehensive Child Development Programs, and would therefore not provide training funds outside their specific projects.

In fact there appears to be only about six "often cited" federal sources of training funds available for the larger child care community. These include funds from: The Social Services Block Grant, The Dependent Care Planning and Development Block Grant, The Child Care Food Program, The Job Training Parternship Act (JTPA), Pell Grants and the CDA Scholarship Act. In additional, funds from the Family Support Act are also beginning to be used as a source for training early childhood providers.

In a recent survey of the States, The Children's Defense Fund (Adams, 1990) found that states reported only spending a little over one million dollars from federal sources on child care training. The most common federal funding sources for training were the CDA Scholarship Program, the Dependent Care Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant. Although this clearly indicates an extremely small amount of federal funds for training, we should view this figure with some caution. Since those responding to the survey may have come from only one type of state agency (ie: Social Services), several other federal sources, such as the food programs and job training, were probably not considered. Furthermore, accurate totals for the use of such funds as JTPA and Pell grants for early childhood training, do not appear readily available.

Despite these limitations, the figure of one million dollars for child care training is particularly alarming given the lack of immediate prospects for significant new federal training dollars. The new Child Care and Development Block Grant includes a $750 million appropriation for the first year.

Twenty five percent of the total allotment is set aside for quality improvements and for grants and contracts for early childhood /latchkey services. However, most of this set aside is earmarked for the early childhood/latchkey services (no less than 75 percent of the set aside). This means that only 20-25 percent of the set aside is specifically targeted for quality. Furthermore, training is only one of six allowable uses for these funds, competing against such big ticket items as salaries, resource and referral and licensing enforcement. Even if we assume that a third of the earmarked quality funds would be used for training, this would only provide some $12.5-15.6 million for training for all 50 states.

Outside of this set aside, it appears that the bulk of the total allotment will be used for direct service. However, the legislation does say that funds can be used for activities to improve the affordability, availability, and quality of child care, and to expand the range of choices of child care services available to parents. Therefore, states may have some discretion on how the main portion of the money is spent. This would mean that a state could also use a part of the "non-earmarked" money for quality improvements. Unfortunately, because many states are facing such severe shortages of child care subsidy funds, particularly in light of demands made by the JOBS program, it may be difficult for training and other quality improvement initiatives to compete with the needs for direct service dollars.

The CDA Scholarship Act is another potential source of training money. In fact this fund is the only source of federal dollars whose sole purpose is the improvement of the early childhood workforce. Although the Scholarship Act has been expanded, it is still extremely limited. The Scholarship Act was first passed as part of Title VI of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986. At that time it was authorized to provide one million dollars to the states for scholarships to cover the cost of CDA credentialing ($325.00 for assessment but not training). The recent reauthorization has expanded the eligibility criteria and allows the use of 35 percent of the money for training. Authorization levels are now at $3 million, however it appears that only about $1.4 million will be appropriated.

Clearly the largest expenditure of federal funds for early childhood training is provided to Head Start programs. In fiscal year 1990, the federal government spent $30.6 million dollars on Head Start training and technical assistance (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1990). Although this is a significant amount compared to funds available to the general child care community, in fact a portion of this money is used for technical assistance in general and more

specifically for technical assistance for services to handicapped children. Furthermore, at this time it is not clear how much of these funds are actually used for teacher training, although a study of this issue is currently underway. Moreover, given the pressing demands on Head Start services, programs have found that the current funding level has not been adequate to meet their training needs. According to the National Head Start Association (NHSA, 1990), as a percentage of total budget, Head Start training funds have decreased since 1974.

Fortunately for Head Start programs, the recent reauthorization will allow 2 percent of the budget to be used for training. If we assume a total Head Start budget of approximately two billion dollars, this will provide some $40 million for training and technical assistance. In addition, the legislation has a ten percent set aside for quality. At least half of this amount must be used for salary increases, with the remaining amount available for a wide variety of quality issues including training (Bolce, 1990).

Finally, with regards to federal funds, the military provides funds for training child care personnel. Again, although total expenditures across all military programs are not easily identified, information is available on the types of activities supported. For example, according to Dr. Beverly Schmalzried, Chief of Community Activities Policy, U.S. Air Force, funds are made available to pay a training and curriculum specialist at the GS 7-9 level (on the average one specialist is provided to every 150 children in military programs or about one trainer to every 30 staff). In addition, funds are available to pay for one hour per week of compensation for release time for training and other funds are available for tuition assistance (Schmalzried, 1990.)

Before leaving the discussion of federal funds, it should be noted that those programs funded by the Higher Education Act (Pell grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, work/study, Guaranteed Student Loans and Perkins Loans) provided over $18 billion dollars of student aide in academic year 1990-91 to help nearly 6 million students meet the costs of post secondary education (Schenet, 1990). Although many of these programs require that a recipient be a full time student, the Higher Education Act does appear to be an important potential source for early childhood training.

At the state level, again there is a lack of comprehensive information. In the CDF state survey (Adams, 1990), states reported spending some $7 million dollars of state money on training. Seven states made no formal efforts to pay for training. Another 10 states described their efforts as "technical assistance", but their activities were limited and often unrelated to training. Five states said they provided

some training, but were unable to specify the level or type of training provided. The remaining 29 states funded specific training efforts. A majority (17 out of 29) spent betweem $100,00 and $400,000.

States spend their training funds in a variety of ways. For example, some spend it on making training more accessible (mobile libraries, teleconferencing, videos, etc), others use it to train on special issues (child abuse, special needs, pediatric aides) and still others use it to train welfare parents for positions in child care. At least four states have established specific scholarship or loan foregiveness programs for child care providers (although clearly different, the terms scholarship and loans are often confused in state legislation). Minnesota provides scholarships for family child care providers to receive a CDA (or centers to go through accreditation). Maine provides some $30,000 in scholarships for people in the field who are pursuing 2 and 4 year degrees. Maryland and Virginia have both established loan forgiveness programs for early childhood staff. In addition, a loan forgiveness program recently passed both houses of the California legislature but was vetoed last month by the Governor (Whitebook, Pemberton, Lombardi, and Galinsky, 1990).

Moving from the state to the program level, we are again faced with a lack of available information on training expenditures. Neither the National Child Care Staffing Study nor the GAO report provide information on how much programs spend on training. The Amercian Society for Training and Development (1990) states that in 1984, American businesses spent an average of 1.4 percent of payroll on formal training. (ASTD recommends 2 percent of payroll). The total average spent per employee in the U.S. on training was $283.00. Given the costs reviewed earlier, and the need for basic entry level training in the early childhood field, this amount would only cover a fraction of training costs.

Finally, there appears to be increasing private investments in early childhood training. Private foundations, at the national and community level, have supported a wide range of training and other initiatives that are focused on the early childhood workforce. In addition, the growing corporate interest in child care is finally beginning to address the quality issues (Galinsky, in press). In their publication on public-private partnerships for child care, the Child Care Action Campaign (Euban and Reisman, 1990) listed several examples of private sector support for training of both center based and family child care providers throughout the country.

Recently, one of the more innovative private sector models to emerge is linking funds for training to higher

salaries. For example, The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (along with the Greater Triangle Community Foundation and the Woodson Foundation) has provided funds to a North Carolina Agency to support 80 percent of the tuition at a local community colleges. Students and employers each contribute 10 percent. Staff will receive a 5 percent merit pay upon completion of six courses, and must agree to continue working in the program for another year. (Report on Preschool Programs, October 10, 1990).

What should be included in a research and policy agenda regarding financing issues ?

The issues surrounding the financing of early childhood training need a much more exhaustive review. The following research questions were developed at a recent "Qualified Workforce Meeting" convened by The Child Care Employee Project (1990):

1. Availability of funds. What sources of funding currently exist at the federal, state and local level? How are these funds distributed ? How are funds being spent across program types and across roles within programs (administrators, techers, family child care) ?

2. Cost effectiveness. What are the advantages and disadvantages of various elements of the training system (content; methodology; distribution of funds to training institutions, versus to programs or individual providers, through grants or loans, etc?) How should funds be targeted? What are the implications of staff turnover for cost effectiveness ?

3. Comparative information. How does the early childhood field compare with other "industries" with regard to training and financing capacity ? What can we learn from other countries with regard to the financing of early childhood professional preparation?

4. Vision. Can we map out what training should cost at the program level and who should bear what costs ? What are the policy implications for this vision ?

As we gather further information on this issue, the critical needs of the early childhood community call for more immediate action to affect policies which will expand the financing of preparation and professional development. The following principles should be considered in the formulation of new policies:

o While training funds should come from a variety of sources, the federal government should play a leadership role to ensure a qualified workforce.

o There should be equitable distribution of public funds for training across early childhood program types, particularly for those programs that serve low income children.

o New funds should be spent on high quality training and on the promotion of a career ladder.

o Policies to expand training opportunities should be accompanied by corresponding efforts to improve compensation and parental recognition of quality services.

o Providers should not have to spend a disproportionate amount of their salaries on training, particularly given the lack of financial incentives provided once they are trained.

o Programs should receive support to help pay for training costs, particularly when they are mandated to meet staffing requirements.

The following strategies could be used to move the policy agenda forward:

o Expand the Higher Education Act, and other appropriate federal legislation to encourage more early childhood training.

o Disseminate information across states regarding legislative models for financing training, career ladders, compensation and parental recognition of quality.

o Promote private sector investments in the early childhood workforce through the establishment of community and/or state quality improvement funds.

o Launch a public awareness campaign on the importance of qualified staff in early childhood programs.

These efforts will need to be supported through technical assistance to states as well as assistance to those people (and groups) in the field who are working to change federal and state policy.

References

Adams, Gina (1990). Who Knows How Safe? The Status of State Efforts to Ensure Quality Child Care. Washington D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

American Society for Training and Development (1990). Fact Sheets: "Amount Spent on Training by American Businesses" and "Highlights of Recommendations from Training America", Alexandria, Virginia: author.

Bolce, Don, Director, Government Affairs, The National Head Start Association, Personal Communication, October 22, 1990.

Child Care Employee Project (1990). unpublished proceedings from the small group session on "financing" at the "Qualified Workforce Meeting" held on October 12-13, 1990, Berkely, California.

Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition (1988). "The 1988 CDA National Survey Results", unpublished manuscript, Washington D.C.: author.

Durbin, E., Kopp, M.& Toland, N. (1990). Funding for Child Care: A Federal Yellow Pages, Washington D.C.: Child Welfare League.

Euban D. and Reisman, B.,(1990). Making the Connections: Public-Private Partnerships in Child Care, New York: Child Care Action Campaign.

Galinsky, E. (in press) "The Private Sector as a Parnter in Early Care and Education", In The National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Sharon L. Kagan, Editor.

Nattinger, Peyton (1990), "The Economic Implications of ECE Preparation in the Community Colleges", an unpublished paper presented at the "The Qualified Workforce Meeting", Berkely, California, October 12-13, 1990.

National Head Start Association, Head Start: A Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge, Alexandria, Virginia: author.

Phillips, Carol, Executive Director, Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition, personal communication, October 19, 1990.

Report on Preschool Programs, October 10, 1990,"Program Links Salary Increases with Child Care Training". Silver Spring, Maryland: author.

Schmalzried, Beverly, Chief, Community Activities Policy, U.S. Air Force, personal communication, October 18, 1990.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, Chairman, Research Division, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, personal communication, October 19, 1990.

Schenet, Margot (1990). CRS Issue Brief: Higher Education: Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C.& Phillips, D. (1989). Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America. Oakland, California: Child Care Employee Project.

Whitebook, M., Pemberton, C., Lombardi, J.,& Galinsky, E., (1990). From the Floor: Raising Child Care Salaries, Oakland, California: Child Care Employee Project.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1990). "Project Head Start Statistical Fact Sheet. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1990) Early Childhood Education: What are the Costs of High Quality Program ? Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

This paper was prepared for the consultation on Preparation and Professional Development Programs for Early Childhood Educators: Emerging Needs for the Next Decade, co-sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York City, November 7-8, 1990. Joan Lombardi has served as a consultant to several national organizations including: The National Head Start Association, The Head Start Bureau, The Child Care Employee Project and The National Association of State Boards of Education. She is a current member of the NAEYC Governing Board.